

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/705,235	Applicant(s) SHIMADA ET AL.	
	Examiner John P. Sheehan	Art Unit 1793	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Amended

 (1) John P. Sheehan.

(3) _____.

 (2) Mr. Bernard P. Codd.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007
Time: 3 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

12-19

Prior art documents discussed:

NONE

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner phoned Mr. Codd regarding non-elected claims 12 to 19. The Examiner explained that the applicants' election was without traverse (response submitted June 22, 2006 and Office action mailed September 6, 2006) and that the subsequent Office actions mailed March 28, 2007 and August 9, 2007 were not correct in describing the election as having been made with traverse. The Examiner explained that therefore the election was without traverse. In view of the fact that the election was without traverse, that the case is otherwise in condition for allowance and that non-elected claims 12 to 19 do not recite all the limitations of the allowable elected claims and therefore are not rejoinable, the Examiner planned to cancel non-elected claims 12 to 19. The Examiner explained that because the election was made without traverse, the cancellation of non-elected claims 12 to 19 did not require applicants' approval. The Examiner further explained that the purpose of the phone call was a courtesy to advise applicants that the election was in fact without traverse and to advise applicants that the Examiner planned to cancel non-elected claims by an Examiner's Amendment.